

REVIEW DRAFT

VERMONT RESULTS FIRST - PROGRAM INVENTORY ADULT CRIMINAL JUSTICE PROGRAMS

The purpose of this program inventory is to categorize criminal justice programs into defined categories of effectiveness to reduce recidivism or otherwise reduce crime. This presents an easy way to identify interventions that have been rated by eight national research clearinghouses¹, Washington State Institute for Public Policy (WSIPP), and included in the Pew-MacArthur Results First benefit-cost model. The information in the inventory was provided by the agency operating the program in Vermont. If no information was received other resources were used.²

The Results First Program Inventory categorizes the programs offered as “Evidence Based,” “Promising,” “No Evidence of Effects,” “Mixed Effects,” or “Negative Effects.” Colors are assigned to each rating to indicate its effectiveness: programs shaded in green are considered to be “Evidence Based,” meaning that rigorous studies indicate they work to reduce recidivism in multiple jurisdictions; “Promising” programs are shaded in yellow, indicating that fewer studies show an effect on recidivism or crime, or that Vermont has significantly changed the way an “Evidence Based” program is delivered; programs with grey shading indicate that rigorous studies show that the program has “No Effect” on recidivism or crime; no shading indicates “No Evidence” that the programs reduce recidivism or crime because no rigorous outcome evaluations have been completed; “Mixed Effects” are shaded in blue and “Negative Effects” in red.

Twenty-Five programs were identified in the Vermont Program Inventory. Of the 25:

52% are Evidence Based of which approximately half (54%) have been or are being evaluated
8% are Promising of which 50% have been or are being evaluated
8% show No Effect - 50% have been evaluated
36% have No Evidence of effectiveness - 25% have been or are being evaluated
4% have Mixed Effects
0% have a Negative Effect

A program delivered in Vermont may be categorized as evidence-based, but its effectiveness needs to be demonstrated by an evaluation to ensure it is achieving the expected outcomes and to document that it is being delivered with fidelity to the model. In the tables below the columns list the evidence base and whether an evaluation has been completed. A program is considered to have had a rigorous evaluation if a control group (e.g., defendants who did not receive the intervention) was used. The footnotes include hyperlinks to published research studies.

¹ Washington State Institute for Public Policy, Blueprints for Healthy Youth Development, California Evidence-Based Clearinghouse for Child Welfare, Coalition for Evidence-Based Policy, CrimeSolutions.gov, National Registry of Evidence-based Programs and Practices, Promising Practices Network, What Works Clearinghouse, and What Works in Reentry Clearinghouse.

² Other sources of information were used when departments or service providers didn’t complete the survey. Not all programs offered in Vermont may be captured in this report.

Department of Corrections Programs					
Program	Target Population	Effectiveness Rating	Evaluations	Control Group Evaluation	Program Cost
Community High School of Vermont	Incarcerated Offenders	Evidence-based ³	No	N/A	\$2,294,219 ⁴
Risk Reduction	Incarcerated Offenders	Evidence-based ⁵	On going	Yes-matched ⁶	TBD
Tapestry	Substance Abuse- Female Offenders	Evidence-based ⁷	No	N/A	\$350,000 ⁸
Correctional Industries	Incarcerated Offenders	Evidence-based ⁹	No	N/A	
Housing Supports	Incarcerated Offenders	Evidence-based ¹⁰	No	N/A	\$6,321,018 ¹¹
Pre-Trial Services	Pre-trial Defendants	No Evidence	On going	Yes- matched	TBD
Work Crew	Low Risk Offenders	No Evidence	No	N/A	

³ <http://www.wsipp.wa.gov/BenefitCost/Program/9>

⁴ Source: DOC Vantage Report: <http://doc.vermont.gov/about/reports/department-of-corrections-budget-documents/fy-2016-doc-vantage-reports-final/view> p. 5

⁵ <http://www.wsipp.wa.gov/BenefitCost/Program/157>

⁶ A matched control group is a control group constructed from administrative records to closely match the treatment group on selected demographics. It does not generally account for self-selection bias. It is considered less rigorous than a Randomized Control Group study.

⁷ <http://www.wsipp.wa.gov/BenefitCost/Program/189>

⁸ Source: DOC Vantage Report: <http://doc.vermont.gov/about/reports/department-of-corrections-budget-documents/fy-2016-doc-vantage-reports-final/view> p. 149

⁹ <http://www.wsipp.wa.gov/BenefitCost/Program/11>

¹⁰ <http://www.wsipp.wa.gov/BenefitCost/Program/128>

¹¹ Source: DOC Vantage Report <http://doc.vermont.gov/about/reports/department-of-corrections-budget-documents/fy-2016-doc-vantage-reports-final/view> P. 150

Community Justice Centers Programs: \$2,258,000 ¹²				
Program	Target Population	Effectiveness Rating	Evaluations	Control Group Evaluation
COSAs	High Risk Re-entry	Promising ¹³	On going	Yes- matched
Reparative Boards	Probationers	Evidence-based ¹⁴	2005 2014	Yes-matched No
Restorative Justice Panels	Low Risk	Evidence-based ¹⁵	2014	No
Retail Theft Prevention	Retail Theft Offenders	No Evidence	None	N/A

Court Diversion Programs: \$1,996,483 ¹⁶				
Program	Target Population	Effectiveness Rating	Evaluations	Control Group Evaluation
Adult Court Diversion	Low Risk	No Evidence	2014	No
DLS (Driving with License Suspended) Program	DLS Defendants	No Evidence	None	N/A
Youth Substance Abuse Safety Program	Minors in Possession	No Evidence	None	N/A

¹² Source: DOC Vantage Report: <http://doc.vermont.gov/about/reports/department-of-corrections-budget-documents/fy-2016-doc-vantage-reports-final/view> p. 150. NOTE: Neither the budget in the Vantage Report nor the funds appropriated for the Community Justice Centers are separated for each program.

¹³ COSAs are considered promising based on the current research being conducted in Vermont.

¹⁴ <http://www.wsipp.wa.gov/BenefitCost/Program/558>

¹⁵ <http://www.wsipp.wa.gov/BenefitCost/Program/558>

¹⁶ Source: Attorney General Vantage Report

<http://ago.vermont.gov/assets/files/FY16%20COURT%20DIVERSION%20BUDGET.pdf> p. 9. Note: The budget is not separated for each program.

Treatment Courts/Specialty Courts : \$602,097 ¹⁷				
Program	Target Population	Effectiveness Rating	Evaluations	Control Group Evaluation
Drug Court	High Risk/High Need Offenders with Substance Dependence	Evidence-based ¹⁸	2009 2014	Yes- matched Yes- matched
Mental Health Court	Offenders with Mental Health Needs	Evidence-based ¹⁹	2013	No
DUI Court	Felony DUI offenders	Evidence-based ²⁰	On going	TBD
Integrated Domestic Violence Docket (IDVD)	Domestic Violence	No Effect ²¹	2011	No

Law Enforcement Based Programs					
Program	Target Population	Effectiveness Rating	Evaluations	Control Group Evaluations	Cost
Electronic Monitoring: Windham	Detainees	Evidence-based ²²	Ongoing	Matched	TBD
Hot Spot Policing: Rutland S. Burlington Springfield	Prevention	Evidence-based ²³	No	N/A	Varies
Project Vision: Rutland	Low Risk	Evidence-based ²⁴	No	N/A	None: Reallocation of resources
License Plate Recognition	Prevention/ Detection	No Effect ²⁵			

¹⁷ Source: Judiciary Vantage Report

<https://www.vermontjudiciary.org/jbn/Shared%20Documents/Vermont%20Judiciary%20-%20Fiscal%20Year%202016%20Budget%20Development.pdf> p.45 and p. 47

¹⁸ <http://www.wsipp.wa.gov/BenefitCost/Program/14>

¹⁹ <http://www.wsipp.wa.gov/BenefitCost/Program/52>

²⁰ <http://www.wsipp.wa.gov/BenefitCost/Program/278>

²¹ https://www.crimesolutions.gov/ProgramDetails.aspx?ID=434&utm_source=eblast&utm_medium=eblast-ncjrs&utm_campaign=CGprog434

²² <http://www.wsipp.wa.gov/BenefitCost/Program/437>

²³ <http://www.wsipp.wa.gov/BenefitCost/Program/236>

²⁴ <http://www.crimesolutions.gov/PracticeDetails.aspx?ID=32>

²⁵ <http://www.crimesolutions.gov/ProgramDetails.aspx?ID=318>

Other Programs						
Program	Agency	Target Population	Effectiveness Rating	Evaluations	Control Group Evaluations	Cost
CRASH	Dept. of Health/ADAP	DUI offenders	Evidence-based ²⁶	None Published ²⁷	N/A	User Fees
Rapid Intervention Community Court (RICC)	Chittenden County States Attorney's Office	Pre-charge	No Evidence	On going	No	TBD
Interlock Devices	Department of Motor Vehicles	DUI offenders	Mixed Effects ²⁸	None	No	User Fees

²⁶ <https://www.changecompanies.net/evidence/>

²⁷ The program does internal evaluations, but no published evaluations were found.

²⁸ <http://www.wsipp.wa.gov/BenefitCost/Program/279>